

REMARKS

The August 4, 2006 Office Action regarding the above-identified application has been carefully considered; and the amendments above together with the remarks that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to respond thereto and address all issues raised in that Action. For reasons discussed below, it is believed that this case is in condition for allowance. Prompt favorable reconsideration of this amended application is requested.

Applicants are filing herewith a supplemental information disclosure statement, citing Japanese documents identified in an action in a related Japanese application as well as U.S. equivalents of two of the Japanese documents. It is requested that reconsideration of this amended application include consideration of all of the documents listed on the citation form (PTO-1449) included with the supplemental information disclosure statement.

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 have been cancelled, and new claims 13-16 are presented above. Issues with respect to the cancelled claims should now be moot. Claims 7 and 13-16 are pending and should be in condition for allowance.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of original claim 7. The Action included a Statement of Reasons for Allowance. However, the discussion in that Statement apparently referred to claim requirements only with respect to claim 4 (see underlined portion of Statement, and the reference to claim 4 at top of page 5 of the Detailed Action). Claim 4 has been cancelled, and the reasoning of the Statement apparently did not apply to allowed claim 7, e.g. because the underlined portion of the Statement does not correspond to the actual recitations in claim 7. Claim 7 has been allowed in the first action, without any rejection or narrowing amendment in this case. It is respectfully submitted that allowed claim 7 should be entitled to the broadest reasonable interpretation and to the broadest range of equivalents that are

appropriate in light of the language of the claims and the supporting disclosure, without reference to the Statement of Reasons for Allowance.

The Examiner rejected original claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Application Publication No. 2004/0237122 to Yamaguchi et al. These rejected claims have been cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that new claims 13-16 are free of this ground of rejection.

New independent claim 13 recites a method for controlling a communication terminal device with a TV function, and the recited method involves a signal strength comparison and related processing based on the result of the signal strength comparison. Support for the methods of claims 13-16 can be found throughout the original specification and drawings. An example of the methodology, with signal strength comparison, appears in FIG. 3; and FIG. 6 shows a table storing base station information, information on TV broadcast receivable areas and signal strengths. In general, attention may be directed to the description running from page 18 line 21 to page 20 line 11 and running from page 28 line 24 to page 32 line 20. Signal strength determinations are discussed, for example, on page 23, lines 5-25.

In the method of independent claim 13, when the terminal moves into a different area for receiving TV broadcasting (from the second area to the first area, as recited in the last paragraph), if the signal strength of the TV broadcasting received at the frequency used in the previous area for receiving TV broadcasting (the “second” area, prior to the move) is higher than the signal strength of the TV broadcasting received at the frequency used in the new area (the “first” area, after the move), then the communication terminal can receive the TV broadcasting at the frequency used in the previous area. Hence, under such a signal strength condition, the terminal does not switch the reception frequency to that for TV broadcasting in the new area. It

is respectfully submitted that this signal strength determination and control technique is not disclosed by the Yamaguchi et al. publication or by any of the art cited in the concurrent information disclosure statement.

Upon entry of the above claim amendments, claims 7 and 13-16 are active in this application, all of which should be allowable over the art. Applicants therefore submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this case should now be ready to pass to issue; and Applicants respectfully request a prompt favorable reconsideration of this matter.

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the August 4, 2006 Office Action Office Action. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in an interview or by an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Keith E. George
Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: November 1, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**